

Message

---

**From:** Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 10/28/2020 6:18:26 PM  
**To:** Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Dunn, Alexandra [dunn.alexandra@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Bolen, Derrick [bolen.derrick@epa.gov]; Mills, Madeline [Mills.Madeline@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Cole, Joseph E. [cole.josephe@epa.gov]; Knorr, Michele [knorr.michele@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Head's up on Progressive Farmer 24c Dicamba Press Inquiry

All- I wanted to flag for your attention this incoming inquiry. I understand there is a meeting on Friday to discuss 24c and folks like Rick plan to chat about these incoming q's then. We did secure a deadline extension from the reporter. -Allison

---

**From:** Garrison, Scott <Garrison.Scott@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 11:54 AM  
**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>; Lara, Rhina <Lara.Rhina@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Knorr, Michele <knorr.michele@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Confidential communication for internal deliberations only. Attorney-client privilege. Do not distribute outside U.S. Government.

## Ex. 5 Attorney Client (AC)

Scott Garrison  
Pesticides and Toxic Substances Law Office (2333A)  
Office of General Counsel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
202-564-4047  
[garrison.scott@epa.gov](mailto:garrison.scott@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina <Lara.Rhina@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB  
**Importance:** High

Hi Dan and Meg,

We got this one from Progressive Farmer. Unfortunately, I am not up to speed on where we left off regarding Section 24© (I know there were some updates recently), so I am sorry for not taking a crack at a response for these.

1. Does the Tuesday dicamba registration decision and announcement re: FIFRA Section 24(c) mark an official change in EPA's position on states' use of Section 24(c)? And if so, has EPA decided to skip the public comment period it committed to on this topic in the spring of 2019?
2. Will this stance on 24c (no state restrictions, only expansions) be applied by EPA uniformly to all future state SLN labels on all pesticides, beyond dicamba?
3. Has EPA's position on this been prompted or influenced by the EPA's Inspector General investigation into states' use of Section 24(c)?
4. Via AAPCO, state regulators have directly petitioned EPA not to take this stance on Section 24(c), which will greatly limit states' ability to react quickly to new dicamba labels, given the cumbersome and time-consuming process of state rulemaking permitted via 24(a). Did EPA consult with state regulators or inform them of this new stance (no restrictions via 24 (c)) before the dicamba decision? Because the state regulators I have spoken to seem taken completely off guard by this announcement by their federal co-regulators.

Best,

**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)

Communications Branch

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 815- 5722